UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,056	01/02/2004	**Gerianne Tringali DiPiano**	FEM 104	1945

23579 7590 05/01/2009

Pabst Patent Group LLP
1545 PEACHTREE STREET NE
SUITE 320
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER	
KIM, JENNIFER M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/751,056	DIPIANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JENNIFER MYONG M. KIM	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 December 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,8,10-12,14,15,17 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10-12, 14, 15, 17 and 19* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7 and 8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/11/09; 3/7/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed December 23, 2008 have been received and entered into the application.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed December 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to 103 rejection, Applicants argue that Ragavan 1 is silent about including penetration enhancers in the formulation. This is not found to be persuasive because Applicants' attention is drawn to Ragavan1, column 9, Example 3, where it teaches that microparticle danazol is formulated with the presence of poly(vinylpyrrilodine) (also known as PVP). One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that poly(vinylpyrrilodine) is a penetration enhancer because it is well known in the art by D'Angelo et al. (U.S.Patent No. 5,614,212), see abstract, column 7, lines 43-46. Applicants argue that the formulations disclosed in Ragavan 1 are meant for delivery across mucosal membranes and that transporting across a mucosal surface into an isolated region is not the same as, nor predictive of, transport through the skin into the breast. "Region" is defined in Ragavan 1 as reproductive organs and their surrounding environs, which include uterus, fallopian tube, peritoneal space, pelvic cul-de-sac, ovaries, perineum and the rectovaginal region. This is not found persuasive because Applicants are reminded that the instant claims are drawn to a "drug formulation". Applicants' recitation of the intension of delivering the drug across the

stratum corneum must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended delivery, then it meets the claim. In this case, Ragavan 1 teaches the same active agent (danazol), the same penetration enhancer (e.g. PVP) and the same amount effective (50mg/day danazol, see Example 3 of Regavan 1) that is the amount effective to provide regional, not systemic, relief from benign dieses or disorder disclosed in the instant specification. (see the specification page 9, under dosage). Therefore, Ragavan1's formulation would have the same functional characteristics such as promoting delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum. Again, Applicants' recitation of the intension of delivering the drug across the stratum corneum must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. Applicants argue that Ragavan 1 employs triethanolamine/sorbitan esters are not invariably penetration enhancers. Applicants enclosed report demonstrates that one cannot use the formulation described in Ragavan for transdermal delivery because it is completely ineffective. This is not found to be persuasive because Applicants have not identified which is the enclosed report that shows the ineffectiveness for transdermal delivery of Ragavan 1's formulation. Further, Ragavan 1 meets all the physical requirement set forth in claim 1, therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Ragavan 1 formulation is too, "capable" of delivering the drug to the breast tissue across the stratum corneum.

With regard to Double Patenting Rejection, Applicants argue that **1)** the instant claims differ with claims of Ragavan 1 (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,856) in drugs to be delivered; region to be treated; need for excipient; and the treatment of different disorders; **2)** the instant claims differ with claims of Ragavan 2 (U.S.Patent No. 6,652,874) in drugs to be delivered, a penetration enhancer to promote delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum; region to be treated; and **3)** the instant claims differ with claims of Ragavan 3 (U.S.Patent No. 6,416,778) in drugs to be delivered, a penetration enhancer to promote delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum; region to be treated.

The argument 1) is not found persuasive because Ragavan 1 in their claim 7, that the formulation requires polymer (carrier, penetration enhancer) that altering rates of drug absorption of the female reproductive organ which includes breasts and wherein the formulation results lesser amount of the drug in the systemic system. Therefore, the claims of the instant Application and the patented claims would have been obvious variations of the other to one of ordinary skill in the art; it is noted that the both sets of claims are drawn to a composition comprising the same active agent (danazol), with polymer (penetration enhancer) that provide less than the effective amount when the drug is administered systemically.

The argument 2) is not found persuasive because Ragavan 2 in their claims 17 and 19, that the formulation can be prepared with a carrier as a topical ointment, cream a lotion and foam results lesser amount of the drug in the systemic system. Therefore, the claims of the instant Application and the patented claims would have been obvious

variations of the other to one of ordinary skill in the art; it is noted that the both sets of claims are drawn to a composition comprising the same active agent (anticancer drug/antiproliferative), with carriers (penetration enhancers) that provide less than the effective amount when the drug is administered systemically.

The argument 3) is not found persuasive because Ragavan 3 in their claims 1, 2 and 12 that the formulation comprising danazol can be prepared with a carrier as a topical ointment, a cream, lotion and a foam to administered to a female reproductive organs. Therefore, the claims of the instant Application and the patented claims would have been obvious variations of the other to one of ordinary skill in the art; it is noted that the both sets of claims are drawn to a composition comprising the same active agent (danazol), with carriers (penetration enhancers) that provide less than the effective amount when the drug is administered systemically. Ragavan 3, in their claim 12 claims that the formulation when administered topically does not cause blood levels of danazol achieve with systemic administration of danazol. As such, the claims of the instant Application and the patented claims would have been obvious variations of the other to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ragavan et al. (U.S.Patent No. 5,993,856) of record.

Ragavan et al. teach a micro or nanoparticulate drug formulation for topical administration comprising **danazole** or anticancer drug, anti-proliferative drug in an effective amount formulated in **foams, gel, lotion, suspension, solution, ointment and cream**. (abstract, claims particularly, claims 31-33, Examples 1-3, column 3, lines 10-21). Ragavan et al., at column 9, Example 3, where it teaches that microparticle danazol is formulated with the presence of **poly(vinylpyrrilodine) (also known as PVP)**. Ragavan et al. teach that the formulation can be formulated as the **micro or nano particulates.** (see claims 6 and 7). Ragavan et al. illustrate the **gel composition**. as well as the employment of **alcohols** as an excipients, and **hydrogel microspheres** made of gel-type polymers for the composition. (Example 1, column 3, lines 15-37, column 4, line 10, column 6, lines 43-45). Ragavan et al. teach that sorbitan esters and triethanolamine (penetration enhancers) can be employed in the formulation. (column 4, lines 4-16). One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that poly(vinylpyrrilodine) is a penetration enhancer. Ragavan et al. teaches that the microparticle **danazol** comprises 10mg/day, 25mg/day, 50mg/day. (Example 3). These dosages are within and/or overlap Applicant's preferred danazol dosage rage in the specification on page 9, under dosage. Ragavan et al. illustrate 1mg gel formulation comprising **microparticulate formulation** of danazol in Examples 1 and 2. Ragavan et al. illustrate that danazole concentrations of 1mg/300g rat were administered and danazol concentrations of 100mg /50kg were administered to women. (table 1). These dosages are within Applicant's dosage range of danazol in the specification page 9. Ragavan et al. teach that the formulation provides significantly

diminished side effects with increased bioavailability and comfort. (column 3, lines 15-20). Ragavan et al. teach that the formulation **provide less amount of danazol in systemically compared to topical.** (see claim 1).

Ragavan et al. do not illustrate the danazole formulation formulated with a hydroalcoholic gel carrier, the formulation providing relief from disease or disorders of the breast and the property of the carrier capable of delivering the drug to the breast tissue and to promote delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum with low serum drug levels compared to the systemic administration of the drug.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Ragavan et al.'s illustrated danazol and PVP formulation by employment of hydroalcoholic gel because Ragan et al. teach that the danazol formulation can be formulated as a gel with the employment of hydrogel microspheres of gel-type polymers together with alcohols as a excipients or carriers as taught by Ragavan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to achieve an expected various topical danazol formulation including gel formulation taught by Ragavan et al. with a reasonable expectation of providing significantly diminished side effects with increased availability and comfort topically as taught by Ragan et al. Applicants' recitation in claims 1 of an intended use of treating benign diseases of the breast and to relief from disease or disorders of the breast do not represent a patentable limitation since such fails to impart any physical limitation to the composition since the prior teaches same formulation comprising the same active agent with the same "effective amount" as claimed by Applicants. Further, the limitation of the

carrier "capable" of delivering the drug for the breast tissue, it is noted that the carriers or excipients employed by Ragan et al. is the same "penetration enhancer" as required by claim 1. Therefore, the same compounds cannot have mutually exclusive properties. Accordingly, the same penetration enhancer taught by Ragan et al. would be "capable" of delivering the drug for the breast tissue and promote delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum upon the contact with skin during an administration step.

Applicants' recitation of the intension of delivering the drug across the stratum corneum must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended delivery, then it meets the claim. In this case, Ragavan 1 teaches the same active agent (danazol), the same penetration enhancer (e.g. PVP) and the same amount effective (50mg/day danazol, see Example 3 of Regavan) that is the amount effective to provide regional, not systemic, relief from benign dieses or disorder disclosed in the instant specification. (see the specification page 9, under dosage). Therefore, Ragavan's formulation would have the same functional characteristics such as promoting delivery of the drug across the stratum corneum. Moreover, Ragavan in their claim 1 teach that the formulation provide the amount less than the amount when the drug is administered systemically. Accordingly, the claimed subject matter is deemed to fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 and 31-33 of U.S. Patent No. 5,993,856. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it encompasses same subject matter. The claims in patent teach a micro or nanoparticulate drug formulation for topical administration comprising danazole or anticancer drug, anti-proliferative drug in an effective amount formulated in foams, tablets and creams and same "effective amounts" of treating a

diseases or disorder in a regions overlap with instantly claimed "effective amounts" to provide relief from disease or disorders of the breast.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,874 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it encompasses same subject matter. The claims in patent teach a drug formulation comprising the drug selected from the group consisting of anticancer drugs, cytotherapeutic drugs, anti-proliferative drugs, and antiviral drugs formulated in micro or naoparticulates with same "effective amounts" of treating a diseases or disorder in a regions overlap with instantly claimed "effective amounts" to provide relief from disease or disorders of the breast. (see example 3, and instant dosage range in the specification on page 9).

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,416,778 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it encompasses same subject matter. The claims in patent teach a drug formulation including liquid suspension, hydrogel or topical ointment or a cream comprising the drug particles danazole for regional administration of an effective amount to provide relief from symptoms of a disease or disorder with same "effective amounts" of treating a diseases or disorder in a regions overlap with instantly

claimed "effective amounts" to provide relief from disease or disorders of the breast. (see example 3, and instant dosage range in the specification on page 9).

None of the claims are allowed.

Any rejection of record not addressed herein is withdrawn.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER M. KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-0628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 3 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jennifer Kim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1617

Jmk
July 16, 2008